

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending. Claims 1, 6, and 8-15 have been amended. Claims 21-24 have been added. Claims 1-24 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 8, 14, 23 and 24 are independent. Reconsideration of the action mailed November 21, 2003 is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. No new matter is added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,606,668 ("Shwed") in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. The Examiner has objected to the drawings and to the specification.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as informal. Applicant has attached formal drawings in response to the Examiner's objection. Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings are in acceptable condition.

Specification

The Examiner has objected to the abstract of the disclosure as containing statements of purported merits. The previous abstract has been deleted and replaced with a new abstract. Applicant respectfully submits that the abstract is in acceptable condition.

The Examiner has also objected to the abstract in that "the attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to several product data sheets is improper because it should be listed as an appendix to the specification or as references on a PTO 1449". Applicant respectfully does not understand the objection to the abstract. The abstract did not include any incorporation by reference. Furthermore, within the application the incorporation by reference of product data sheets is listed as an appendix to the specification. See, page 6 lines 3-4 "selected web pages describing NetScreen's high-speed firewalls are provided as Appendix A to this application." Applicant respectfully submits that the specification is in acceptable condition.

A

Section 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as unpatentable over Shwed in light of Applicant's admitted prior art. Claim 1 recites "a filter including a second set of rules for receiving and further sorting the initially denied packets into allowed packets and denied packets."

In Shwed, packet filter modules are disclosed that, based on a set of rules, either allow or deny a packet. The packet filters are located at multiple points within a network. However, packets, once identified as denied, are not allowed to proceed and are, for example, dropped. See FIG. 5 block 530 and FIG. 6 block 616. Shwed does not disclose or suggest a further sorting of initially denied packets into allowed packets and denied packets. In Shwed, packets that have been initially processed and denied are not then further processed such that some of the denied packets can be allowed to pass as a result.

Additionally, Applicant's disclosed prior art firewall does not disclose further sorting of initially denied packets into allowed packets and denied packets. Because neither Shwed nor the Applicant's disclosed prior art disclose or suggest limitations of claim 1 Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 as unpatentable over Shwed in light of Applicant's admitted prior art. Claim 8 is directed to a computer program product that includes instructions for causing a computer to further process initially denied packets using the dynamically generated rules. Shwed does not disclose or suggest further processing of initially denied packets using dynamically generated rules. For at least the foregoing reasons as well as the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 8, as well as claims 9-13, which depend from claim 8, are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected method claims 14 and 18 as unpatentable over Shwed in light of Applicant's admitted prior art. Claims 14 and 18 are directed to methods for providing network computer security and include steps of further processing the initially denied packets into allowed and denied packets using rules. Shwed does not disclose or suggest further

2


processing of initially denied packets into allowed and denied packets. For at least the foregoing reasons as well as the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claims 14 and 18, as well as claims 15-17, 21-22 and 19-20, which depend from claims 14 and 18 respectively, are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 as unpatentable over Shwed in light of Applicant's admitted prior art. Claim 5 recites "modifying some subset of the initially allowed packets." In Shwed, packets are not modified. Address information can be extracted from a packet in order to apply rules to the packet, however the packet is not modified. See, e.g., col. 9 line 64 to col. 10 line 65 describing the implementation of a security rule on a packet. Because Shwed does not disclose or suggest modifying some subset of the initially allowed packets, Shwed does not disclose or suggest claim 5. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5, as well as claim 6, which depends from claim 5, is in condition for allowance.

Please charge the excess claim fee amount of \$244 to our Deposit Account, No. 60-1050. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 23 February, 2004



Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

a